UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,270	02/17/2004	Michael S. Bender	5681-76100	2233

35690   7590   09/19/2006

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER
FARROKH, HASHEM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2187	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary for Applications Under Accelerated Examination	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/780,270	BENDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hashem Farrokh	2187	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Since this application has been granted special status under the accelerated examination program,

NO extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be permitted and a SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE:

ONE MONTH OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER,
FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION – if this is a non-final action or a *Quayle* action.
(Examiner: For **FINAL** actions, please use PTOL-326.)

The objective of the accelerated examination program is to complete the examination of an application within twelve months from the filing date of the application. Any reply must be filed electronically via EFS-Web so that the papers will be expeditiously processed and considered. If the reply is not filed electronically via EFS-Web, the final disposition of the application may occur later than twelve months from the filing of the application.

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 February 2000*.
2) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

3) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

   3a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
5) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

8) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
9) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

10) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

11) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/31/06*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The instant application having application No. 10/875,500 has a total of 30 claims

pending in the application; there are 3 independent claims and 27 dependent claims, all

of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

INFORMATION CONCERNING CLAIMS:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1.   Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because these claims are not

limited to tangible embodiments. In view of applicants' disclosure, specification page

[28], lines [14-19], the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being

defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., [volatile and non-volatile media

such as RAM]) and intangible embodiments (e.g., [transmission media or signals]). As

such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

The Applicant may overcome the above 101 rejections by amending the claims

to replace "A computer-accessible medium" with --A computer-accessible storage

medium--

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, AND 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2001/0032235 A1 to Madany et al. (hereinafter Madany).

2. In regard to claim 1 Madany teaches:

"A system **(e.g., Fig. 1; claim 1)**, comprising:"

"a server configured to execute an application;" **(e.g., see paragraph 34 in page 3;**

claim 1).

"a stateless client coupled to said server **(e.g., see claim 1; elements 100 and 101 in**

Fig. 1), whereby a user interacts with said application;" **(e.g., see paragraph 38 in**

page 3; paragraph 40 in page 3). *For example Madany teaches that a user may*

interact using a Human Interface Device (HID).

"and a storage device locally coupled to said stateless client **(e.g., Flash 405; Smart**

card Interface 408 in Fig 4), wherein said storage device is accessible by said user via

said server." **(e.g., see paragraph 36 in page 3).** *For example HID is a part of client*

and include different types of storage or interface to storage or memory devices. The

user can access the smart card attached to a client from any client. The interface to a

client not logged on by the user is inherently accessed via server.

3. In regard to claim 8 Madany teaches:

"A method **(e.g., see claim 11)**, comprising:"

"executing an application on a server;" **(e.g., see paragraph 34 in page 3; claim 1).**

"a user interacting with said application via a stateless client;" **(e.g., see claim 1;**

elements 100 and 101 in Fig. 1).

"and said user accessing a storage device via said server **(e.g., see paragraph 36 in**

page 3), wherein said storage device is locally coupled to said stateless client." **(e.g.,**

Flash 405; Smart card Interface 408 in Fig 4). For example a user logged on another

client via the server can access client storage.

4.   *In regard to claims 2 and 9 Madany teaches:*

"wherein said storage device is locally coupled to said stateless client via a Universal

Serial Bus (USB) or IEEE 1394 interface." **(e.g., see paragraph 49 in page 4; element**

413 in Fig. 4).

5.   *In regard to claims 3 and 10 Madany teaches:*

"wherein said storage device is a mass storage device employing magnetic media."

(e.g., see paragraph 31 in page 2). *For example magnetic card is a magnetic media.*

6.   *In regard to claims 5 and 12 Madany teaches:*

"wherein said storage device is a solid- state mass storage device." **(e.g., see**

paragraph 48 in page 4; Flash Memory 405 in Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Madany in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047454 A1 to Soderstorm et al.

(hereinafter Soderstorm).

7.   *In regard to claims 4 and 11 Madany teaches all limitations included in the base*

claims but does not expressly teach: "wherein said storage device is a mass storage

device employing optical media."

Soderstorm teaches: "wherein said storage device is a mass storage device

employing optical media." **(e.g., see paragraph 27 in page 3)** *for using an optical*

storage media in a storage server.

Disclosures by Madany and Soderstorm are analogous because both references related

to network storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to

modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the optical

storage media taught by Soderstorm.

The motivation for using optical storage media (e.g., CD ROM) as taught by paragraph

7, page 1 of Soderstorm *is the high storage capacity.*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Soderstorm with

Madany to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Madany in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0064461 A1 to Pooni et al.

(hereinafter Pooni).

8.   *In regard to claims 6 and 13 Madany teaches all limitations included in the base*

claims but does not expressly teach: "wherein said server is further configured to

provide a kernel execution mode and a user execution mode, and wherein said server is

further configured to execute a storage service daemon, wherein said storage service

daemon executes in user execution mode."

Poona teaches: "wherein said server is further configured to provide a kernel

execution mode and a user execution mode **(e.g., see paragraph 52 in page 5)**, and

wherein said server is further configured to execute a storage service daemon **(e.g.,**

see paragraph 52 in page 5), wherein said storage service daemon executes in user

execution mode." **(E.g., see paragraph 39 in page 4)** *for executing storage service*

(e.g., SCSI subsystem) daemon in user mode.

Disclosures by Madany and Pooni are analogous because both references related to

network storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to

modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the kernel mode

and user mode taught by Pooni.

The motivation for executing storage service daemon in user mode as taught by

paragraph 33, page 3 of Pooni is a method and arrangement for dynamically detecting

one or more SCSI devices on a Linux host, thus improving the method existed in prior

art (see background of invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Pooni with Madany to

obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Madany in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0056063 A1 to Hochmuth et al.

(hereinafter Hochmuth).

9.   In regard to claims 7 and 14 Madany teaches all limitations included in the base

claims but does not expressly teach: "wherein said storage device comprises one or

more unit interfaces, wherein each unit interface comprises one or more logical units

(LUNs), and wherein each logical unit comprises one or more partitions."

Hochmuth teaches: "wherein said storage device comprises one or more unit

interfaces **(e.g., paragraph 30 in pages 4 to 5)**, wherein each unit interface comprises

one or more logical units (LUNs) **(e.g., paragraph 30 in pages 4 to 5)**, and wherein

each logical unit comprises one or more partitions." **(e.g., paragraph 14 in page 2)** *for*

partitioning the logical storage units.

Disclosures by Madany and Hochmuth are analogous because both references related

to network storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to

modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the storage

device with logical storage units partitioning taught by Hochmuth.

The motivation for logical storage partitioning as taught by paragraph 9, page 1 of

Hochmuth is to provide a secure storage access configuration module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Hochmuth with

Madany to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claims 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Madany in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,550 B1 to Doyle et al. (hereinafter Doyle).

10.   *In regard to claim 15 Madany teaches:*

"A computer-accessible medium **(e.g., paragraph 27 in page 2)** comprising program

instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable by a server to:"

(e.g., see paragraphs 27-28 in page 2).

"and interface said storage device to an application executable on said server;" **(e.g.,**

see paragraph 38 in page 3; paragraph 40 in page 3; Fig. 4). For example HID as

part of client interface to Network (element 402 in Fig. 4) and storage devices included

in the client (see Fig. 4).

"wherein a user interacts with said application via said stateless client **(e.g., see**

paragraph 31 in pages 2 to 3), and wherein said storage device is accessible by said

user via said server." **(e.g., see paragraph 36 in page 3).** *For example HID is a part of*

client and include different types of storage or interface to storage or memory devices.

The user can access the smart card attached to a client from any client. The interface to

a client not logged on by the user is inherently accessed via server. However, Madany

does not expressly teach: "detect the presence of a storage device locally coupled to a

stateless client;"

        Doyle teaches: "detect the presence of a storage device locally coupled to a

stateless client;" **(e.g., see claim 11 in page 11)** *for detecting, at the client computer, a*

storage device used to access the host computer.

Doyle teaches: "detect the presence of a storage device locally coupled to a stateless client;" **(e.g., see claim 11 in page 11)** *for detecting, at the client computer, a storage device used to access the host computer.*

Disclosures by Madany and Doyle are analogous because both references related network computing.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the method of detecting storage device taught by Doyle.

The motivation for detecting the storage device as taught by column 2, lines 32-36 of Doyle is to establish a connection to the target computer with the user information, with the ability to use the infrastructure for authentication when a smart card can not be used at the data processing system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Doyle with Madany to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

11.   In regard to claim 16 Madany teaches:

"wherein said storage device is locally coupled to said stateless client via a Universal Serial Bus (USB) or IEEE 1394 interface." **(e.g., see paragraph 49 in page 4; element 413 in Fig. 4).**

12.   In regard to claim 17 Madany teaches:

"wherein said storage device is a mass storage device employing magnetic media."

(e.g., see paragraph 31 in page 2). *For example magnetic card is a magnetic media.*

13.   *In regard to claim 19 Madany teaches:*

"wherein said storage device is a solid- state mass storage device." **(e.g., see**

paragraph 48 in page 4; Flash Memory 405 in Fig. 4).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madany

in view of Doyle as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Soderstorm.

14.   *In regard to claim 18 combined teaching of Madany and Doyle include all*

limitations recited in claim 15 but does not expressly teach: "wherein said storage

device is a mass storage device employing optical media."

Soderstorm teaches: "wherein said storage device is a mass storage device

employing optical media." **(e.g., see paragraph 27 in page 3)** *for using an optical*

storage media in a storage server.

Disclosures by Madany, Doyle, and Soderstorm are analogous because all related to

network storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to

modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the method of

detecting storage device taught by Doyle; furtheremore, to include the optical storage

media taught by Soderstorm.

The motivation for detecting the storage device as taught by column 2, lines 32-36 of

Doyle is to establish a connection to the target computer with the user information, with

the ability to use the infrastructure for authentication when a smart card can not be used

at the data processing system. Furthermore, the motivation for using optical storage

media (e.g., CD ROM) as taught by paragraph 7, page 1 of Soderstorm is the high

storage capacity.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Soderstorm with

Madany and Doyle to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madany

in view of Doyle as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Pooni.

15.   In regard to claim 20 Madany in view of Doyle teaches all limitations included in

claim 15 but does not expressly teach: "wherein said server is further configured to

provide a kernel execution mode and a user execution mode, and wherein said server is

further configured to execute a storage service daemon, wherein said storage service

daemon executes in user execution mode."

Poona teaches: "wherein said server is further configured to provide a kernel

execution mode and a user execution mode **(e.g., see paragraph 52 in page 5)**, and

wherein said server is further configured to execute a storage service daemon **(e.g.,**

see paragraph 52 in page 5), wherein said storage service daemon executes in user

execution mode." **(e.g., see paragraph 39 in page 4)** *for executing storage service*

(e.g., SCSI subsystem) daemon in user mode.

Disclosures by Madany, Doyle, and Pooni are analogous because all related to network

storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to

modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the method of

The motivation for detecting the storage device as taught by column 2, lines 32-36 of

Doyle is to establish a connection to the target computer with the user information, with

the ability to use the infrastructure for authentication when a smart card can not be used

at the data processing system. Furthermore, the motivation for executing storage

service daemon in user mode as taught by paragraph 33, page 3 of Pooni is a method

and arrangement for dynamically detecting one or more SCSI devices on a Linux host,

thus improving the method existed in the prior art (see background of invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Pooni with Madany

and Doyle to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madany

in view of Doyle as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Hochmuth.

16.   *In regard to claim 21 Madany in view of Doyle teaches all limitations included in*

claim 15 but does not expressly teach: "wherein said storage device comprises one or

more unit interfaces, wherein each unit interface comprises one or more logical units

(LUNs), and wherein each logical unit comprises one or more partitions."

Hochmuth teaches: "wherein said storage device comprises one or more unit

interfaces **(e.g., paragraph 30 in pages 4 to 5)**, wherein each unit interface comprises

one or more logical units (LUNs) **(e.g., paragraph 30 in pages 4 to 5)**, and wherein

each logical unit comprises one or more partitions." **(e.g., paragraph 14 in page 2)** *for*

partitioning the logical storage units.

each logical unit comprises one or more partitions." **(e.g., paragraph 14 in page 2)** *for partitioning the logical storage units.*

Disclosures by Madany, Doyle, and Hochmuth are analogous because all references related to network storage and computing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art to modify the stateless information appliance taught by Madany to include the method of detecting storage device taught by Doyle; furthermore to include the storage device with logical storage units partitioning taught by Hochmuth.

The motivation for detecting the storage device as taught by column 2, lines 32-36 of Doyle is to establish a connection to the target computer with the user information, with the ability to use the infrastructure for authentication when a smart card can not be used at the data processing system. Furthermore, the motivation for logical storage partitioning as taught by paragraph 9, page 1 of Hochmuth is to provide a secure storage access configuration module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine disclosures by Hochmuth with Madany and Doyle to obtain the invention as specified in the claim

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon are as follows:

1.   U. S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099634 A1 to Coutts et al. describes Transaction processing systems.

2.   *U. S. Patent No. 6,829,356 B1 to Ford describes Server-assisted regeneration of*

a strong secret from a weak secret.

1.   *U. S. Patent Publication No. US 2005/0091212 A1 to Mohamed et al. describes*

Method and system for accessing a file.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hashem

Farrokh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4193. The examiner can normally be

*reached Monday-Friday from **8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.***

If attempt to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Mr. Donald A Sparks, can be reached on (571) 272-4201.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

application may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished application is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBS) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HF

2006-09-11

Brian R Peugh
Primary Examiner